DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 904 HE 023 919

AUTHOR Armour, Robert; And Others
TITLE Senior Faculty Careers and Personal Development: A Survey.
SPONS AGENCY Virginia Commonwealth Univ., Richmond.
PUB DATE Mar 90
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989). For related document, see HE 023 759.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Development; *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Cooperation; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Individual Development; Intellectual Disciplines; Job Satisfaction; Older Adults; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Morale

ABSTRACT

A total of 1,135 senior faculty from 6 institutions of higher education responded to a questionnaire designed to determine the relationships between personal and career development for senior college faculty and the similarities and differences in satisfaction among faculty from various disciplines. Responses from the questionnaire showed that aging faculty remain internally controlled, vital, and productive while being active in areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Level of satisfaction was not shown to vary significantly by race, gender, or academic discipline. Senior faculty did not want to give up their jobs and leave academia, and most did not want to leave their present institutions. Senior faculty also tended to rate their abilities as high in teaching, scholarship, and service; felt more vital and committed to their work than ever before; and would choose an academic career if they could make the decision again. Additionally, recognition from administrators was found to be a good predictor of faculty satisfaction. Faculty profiles were developed for major disciplines. Contains 20 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Senior Faculty Careers and Personal Development:

A Survey

by Robert Armour, Rosemary Caffarella
Barbara Fuhrmann, Jon Wergin
Virginia Commonwealth University

Paper Presented at AERA March, 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Armour
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED323904

HE 023 919

OBJECTIVES

This study was conducted to determine the relationships between personal and career development for senior college faculty. Specific objectives were to determine the extent to which faculty personal and career development are affected by job satisfaction and a sense of community. The focus of this report is on the similarities and differences in satisfaction and in career development among faculty from various disciplines.

FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY

Research measuring faculty attitudes has presented conflicting testimony concerning their opinions of their careers. Schuster and Bowen wrote: "At two-thirds of the campuses we visited faculty morale seemed no better than fair and at a quarter of the campuses we characterized morale as 'very poor'... We interviewed senior faculty members who were angry, embittered, and feeling devalued and abandoned" (1985, pp. 15, 19). A Carnegie report (1985) claimed that 40% of college faculty are considering leaving the profession within five years. On the other hand, Eble and McKeachie (1985) found that 90% of faculty are moderately or well satisfied; and at Indiana University Sorcinelli (1985) found no wide-spread depression about the

profession and uncovered good morale among faculty.

Boyer's (1987) report presented mixed evidence of faculty morale. Seventy-eight percent of faculty polled (in 1984) reported that they would choose the profession again if given the choice; but 41% are less enthusiastic than they were when they began their careers. Clark (1987), using the same data as Boyer, reported that only 22% of their respondents strongly believed they were trapped in the profession, while 50% strongly disagreed.

Within this framework we studied senior faculty at six institutions to try to understand these conflicting views of faculty by investigating aspects of senior faculty careers which earlier research of ours (1987) had suggested would be promising.

Although we did not set out to validate earlier studies, but to further the evidence by investigating new areas, we did discover that our findings closely paralleled some of the earlier studies to the extent that we had overlap. Ninety percent of our sample reported that they were either very or somewhat satisfied with their careers. Only 12% wanted to leave academe, while 82% would either probably or definitely chose the career if they could remake the decision. We suggest that the similarities of our general findings with some earlier research studies validates our data and confirms the value of our other findings of disciplinary differences which no earlier research has studied.

METHODS

In the spring of 1988, we distributed a 20 page questionnaire to 1564 senior faculty at six institutions in

central Virginia. The six were chosen because they were members of the Central Virginia Faculty Consortium, for which the researchers serve as staff. The purpose of the consortium is to foster development among senior faculty, so the research was conducted, in part, to advance the interests of the Consortium. Since the colleges represented almost the entire range of higher educational institutions (a community college, a small traditionally black university, a liberal arts college, two small universities, and a large research university), we felt that the sample would well represent the diversity of American higher education. "Senior faculty" was defined as all tenured faculty at the rank of full, associate or assistant professor.*

Faculty identified themselves as belonging to one of five general disciplinary categories: humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, health professions, and other professions (law, business, fine arts, education, and so forth). With the exception of the health professions, each discipline group was well represented in each of the six institutions surveyed.

Of the 1564 questionnaires sent out, 1135 were returned for a response rate of 74%, above the norm for surveys of faculty.

RESULTS

Characteristics of respondents. A profile of the senior faculty who responded shows that the mean age is 50. The average senior faculty member has spent 16 years at his or her current institution and 9 years at current rank. He or she spends 50

---

*At one surveyed institution, there is no tenure, but a system of multi-year contracts.

hours a week working as a faculty member, of which 45% is spent teaching, 24% in service, 21% in research, and the rest in other activities. Forty-nine percent are full professors, 44% associates, 6% assistants. Sixteen percent teach the humanities, 18% the natural sciences, 12% the social sciences, 25% the health professions, and 29% other professions. Eighty-two percent are male; 18% female. Ninety-four percent are white.

FINDINGS

In order to understand the relationship between personal growth and career development, we divided the data into three categories: job satisfaction, community, and personal and career matters, and tested for significant differences among disciplinary categories.

Satisfaction

General satisfaction levels are high. Nearly half (47%) of all respondents reported being "very satisfied" with their faculty careers; most of the others (44%) reported being "somewhat satisfied," while less than 10% indicated they were "not very satisfied" or "not at all satisfied." These percentages did not differ significantly by either institution or discipline. Further, fully 87% of respondents reported their careers to be at least as satisfying as they had expected upon entry into the profession, although significant differences were found by discipline, ranging from 70% among the humanities faculty to more than 90% of those in the health professions. Eighty-two percent of all respondents would "probably" choose a faculty career again.

As expected, ratings of overall satisfaction were significantly related to many other survey variables. Scaled responses most related to satisfaction included: satisfaction with use of abilities ($r = .58$) and advancement (.55), the extent to which faculty were currently feeling "stuck" in their careers (-.55), the extent to which respondents questioned whether "this is all there is" (-.52) and felt restless (-.52), and the degree to which they found their current lives rewarding (.57). All of these correlations were significant at $p < .001$. Nominal variables related significantly to satisfaction ($p < .01$) included: rank, interest in or chances of moving to another institution or career (inversely); time devoted to faculty roles, both individually and in comparison with other institutional faculty; existence of unmet goals (inversely); perceived influence in the department, institution, and discipline; consistency of interest in a specialty area since graduate school; perception of when their best work was done (those most satisfied indicated more frequently that they were <u>currently</u> doing their best work); anticipated retirement age (most satisfied: after 65); and personal health.

Variables <u>not</u> related significantly to satisfaction, besides institution and discipline, included: years as a faculty member and years at current rank; importance of research to the institution; effort compared to others in the discipline; most important accomplishments, by type (teaching, research, service); and all demographic variables, including age, gender, race/ethnic background, marital status and presence of children or a

dependent adult at home.

To determine which combination of responses best predicted overall satisfaction, we undertook a stepwise multiple regression analysis, using overall satisfaction as the criterion variable. A total of 16 predictor variables emerged from this analysis ($p < .05$), accounting for 71% of the variance in satisfaction (Table 1). Not surprisingly, the strongest single predictor ($R^2=.29$) was the extent to which the respondent's career had met or exceeded expectations. Of the next four variables, three (amount of recognition from administration, perceived influence in the department or school, and satisfaction with standard of living) reflected characteristics of the institutional environment, while one (career stuckness) reflected a more personal assessment. These five variables together accounted for 57% of the total variance in satisfaction.

Issues of "community"

In terms of professional collaboration with colleagues, 20% of the sample reported "a great deal," 45% reported "some," 25% reported "a little," and 10% reported "none," with significant differences by discipline. Health professionals reported the most collaboration; humanities professors the least ($F=28.70$; $p <.001$). In terms of sharing of professional interests, 23% reported "a great deal," 47% reported "some," 25% reported "a little," and 5% reported "none," again with significant differences by discipline. The health professionals again reported the most; the social scientists the least ($F=13.25$; $p < .001$). In terms of help with physical or emotional aspects of

Table 1

Stepwise Multiple Regression: Overall Satisfaction

Variable	Cumulative R^2
1. Satisfaction vs. expectations as graduate student	.29
2. Recognition received from administration	.42
3. Extent to which career is "stuck" (negative)	.49
4. Perceived influence in department or school	.53
5. Satisfaction with standard of living	.57
6. Feelings of "restlessness" in career (negative)	.59
7. Feeling "free" (vs. "tied down")	.61
8. Interest in same specialization since tenure	.63
9. Self-rating. of performance: service	.64
10. Commitment to work	.65
11. Importance of other scholarly/creative activities to institution	.66
12. Satisfaction with how time spent	.67
13. Satisfaction with variety in work	.68
14. Opportunities for community service	.69
15. Importance of research activities to self	.70
16. Recognition received from faculty outside institution	.71

personal life, 6% reported "a great deal," 25% reported "some," 32% reported "a little," and 38% reported "none," with no differences by discipline. On socializing with colleagues, 7% reported "a great deal," 36% reported "some," 43% reported "a little," and 14% reported "none," again with no differences by discipline. Fifty-one percent of the entire sample reported that they have more than average influence in their department/school, with no differences by discipline. In terms of influence within the institution, however, there were significant differences by discipline. Whereas 29% of the total sample reported "more than average" institutional influence, there was a range from 39% in the humanities to 24% in the other professions ($X^2 = 15.70$; $p < .05$). In terms of influence in the discipline or the field, 41% of the sample reported more than average influence, with 46% of the health professionals but only 33% of the social scientists so reporting ($X^2 = 18.75$; $p < .05$).

When asked to compare how hard they work with how hard other faculty work, significant differences by discipline were reported in comparisons by department/school and by discipline/field, but not within the institutions. Sixty one percent of the entire sample reported working harder than department or school colleagues, with a range from 55% of the humanities faculty to 70% of the other professionals ($X^2 = 25.01$; $p < .01$). In comparison within the discipline/field, 40% reported working harder, with a range from 31% in the natural sciences to 45% in the other professions ($X^2 = 15.88$; $p < .05$).

When asked to describe their institutional community, 17% of the sample identified people in their department, 24% identified their academic department as a whole, 31% identified people in various departments of the college or university, and 29% identified the college or university as a whole, with significant differences by discipline. Humanities professors most often identified people in various departments (39%) as did natural scientists (39%) and health professionals (33%), with social scientists identifying both people in various departments (30%) and the college as a whole (30%), and other professionals most often identifying the institution as a whole (33%) ($X^2 = 46.89$; $p < .001$).

Finally, there were also significant differences by discipline in respondents' descriptions of their social community. Sixty-five percent of all respondents identified people outside the institution as their primary "social" community, with a range from 53% in the humanities to 71% in the other professions ($X^2 = 44.44$; $p < .001$).

Personal and Career Matters

Career History. Confirming findings by Sorcinelli (1986) and Fuhrmann and others (1988), survey faculty in the humanities decided to enter academe earliest (55% in undergraduate school or earlier), and those in the professions decided latest (70% in graduate school or later). For all respondents, either the desire to be a teacher or the attraction of the academic life style was most often highlighted as the single most important motivator in their decision to become professors, with significant

differences by discipline (X^2 = 128.86; $p < .001$). A larger percentage of faculty in the humanities (40%) were motivated by a desire to be a teacher than faculty from the other fields of study, while a larger percentage of social scientists ranked academic life style (35%) as their major motivator. A consistent minority of faculty (11% to 15%) in the natural sciences, social sciences and health professions also listed the opportunity or the desire to do research as the single most important motivator in making their initial career decision.

Sixty-nine percent of the faculty had held a faculty position somewhere else before coming to their present position. Significant differences were found among the disciplines (X^2 = 47.70; $p < .001$) with the humanities faculty the most likely to have been faculty at other institutions (82%), and those in the health professions the least likely (55%).

Over half of the faculty surveyed had pursued a career outside of academe; of these 87% said it was related or somewhat related to their academic field. Significant differences (X^2 = 100.36; $p < .001$) were found among the disciplines with faculty from the other professions most likely to have held positions outside of the academy (75%), while those in the humanities and natural sciences were least likely to have done so (38%). Those in the other professions were also the most likely (54%) to be currently pursuing a career in concert with their academic appointments.

Professional Activity and Accomplishments. These senior faculty indicated that they spend about 50 hours a week on the

job. Significant differences were found by disciplines ($F = 13.93$; $p < .001$). Faculty in the humanities and the health professions indicated they spend the greatest number of hours (53) working, while those in the other professions the fewest (45). The respondents invest about the same level of effort as when they first received tenure. They spend about 45% of their time in teaching, 24% in service, 21% in research, and 8% in other creative/scholarly activities. Significant differences were found among the disciplines for each of the major categories of effort. Among the disciplines, humanities faculty spend the most time teaching, health professionals spend the most in service, natural scientists spend the most in research, and other professions spend the most in other scholarly/creative activities (Table 2). In contrast, the health professionals spend the lowest percentage of their time teaching (38%), other professionals in research (14%), and natural scientist in other creative/scholarly activity (6%). Also, all but the health professionals appear to invest a similar percentage of their time (approximately 22%) in service activities, compared to 31% for the health professionals.

Across the board senior faculty reported remaining active in teaching, serving, and researching. Within the last five years a majority of these faculty have published articles (77%), taught new courses (68%), received outside funding (63%), acted as paid consultants (60%), experimented with alternative teaching methods (60%), and served in elected or appointed posts in professional organizations (53%).

For 64% of the surveyed faculty, their academic

Table 2

Time Spent (%)

	Teaching	Service	Research	Other Scholarly
Humanities	54.21	21.52	16.98	6.77
Natural Sciences	40.04	20.93	33.08	5.79
Social Sciences	46.94	22.72	23.13	6.38
Health Professions	37.65	31.10	21.35	8.22
Other Professions	47.75	22.41	13.68	12.56
F	19.85	13.63	38.10	16.38
p	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001

specialization is similar to the area they concentrated on when they were graduate students, and for appropriately three-fourths their specialization is similar both to when they were first hired at their institution and to when they were first awarded tenure. Significant differences were found among the disciplines ($X^2 = 33.72$; $p < .001$). More faculty from the professions than the liberal arts maintained specific academic specialties. Most faculty also have remained interested in the same specialty area since graduate school. But again significant differences were found among the disciplines ($X^2 = 50$; $p < .001$); those who have changed the most are the natural scientists.

Overall the respondents rated themselves very good to excellent in teaching, very good in service, good to very good in research, and very good in other creative/scholarly activities. No significant differences were found between pairs of individual disciplines in any of these performance ratings. About two-thirds of the respondents felt their immediate supervisor would rate them "better than average" compared to other faculty in their division; 80% agreed with this rating.

When looking at these same components of their work, the respondents see teaching as "very important," research and other creative/scholarly activity as "important," and service as "somewhat important" to them. Respondents rated service and other scholarly activity, approximately the same in perceived importance to the institution. Teaching was viewed as less important to the institution than to the respondents themselves, while the reverse was true for research activities. As shown in

Table 3, significant differences were found by discipline. Teaching is given higher importance ratings, both for self and the institution, by those in the humanities and in the other professions; service is given higher ratings by those in the health professions; and research is given lower ratings (self only) by those in the other professions. No significant differences by discipline were found in importance ratings for other scholarly/creative activities.

Ninety-three percent believe they have at least equal control with outside forces over their career, with 68% feeling they controlled most or all of their careers. Despite this feeling of control, 42% of the respondents indicated that since being awarded tenure they have felt "stuck" at some point in their academic career development. A greater percentage of faculty in the humanities (55%) than in the other disciplines had this sense of "stuckness" ($X^2 = 17.66$; $p < .01$). Factors the respondents gave most often that contributed to this feeling of "stuckness" were lack of funding, diminished energy, conflicts with administration, being outside the "in group," an unchanging work environment, and lack of intellectual stimulation and opportunity.

When faculty were asked to list their most important professional accomplishments, 53% of the entries dealt with teaching-related activities, 25% with research/scholarly activities, 11% with service-related activities, and 11% with other activities. Significant differences were found among the

Table 3

Mean Ratings of Importance:
Teaching, Service, Research, Other Scholarly Activities
by Discipline

	Teaching		Service		Research		Other Scholarly	
	Inst.	Self	Inst.	Self	Inst.	Self	Inst.	Self
Humanities	4.20	4.76	3.35	3.12	4.13	3.91	3.94	3.91
Natural Sciences	3.88	4.47	3.37	3.05	4.41	4.07	3.82	3.93
Social Sciences	4.04	4.53	2.97	3.34	4.24	4.06	3.57	3.87
Health Professions	3.76	4.55	3.76	3.87	4.44	3.89	3.96	4.13
Other Professions	4.24	4.73	3.51	3.58	4.23	3.50	4.02	4.04
TOTAL	4.03	4.62	3.45	3.46	4.30	3.83	3.90	4.00
F	6.55	5.66	8.12	17.80	2.19	3.72	.99	.84
df	4;1032	4;998	4;1032	4;998	4;1032	4;998	4;1032	4;998
p	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	NS	<.001	NS	NS

disciplines ($X^2 = 56.85$; $p < .001$). A larger percentage of faculty in the humanities (62%) and in the other professions (58%) indicated "teaching" more often, while a larger percentage of faculty in the natural (43%) and social (33%) sciences listed "research."

Almost two-thirds (63%) of the respondents indicated they had developed a "niche" for themselves within the institution; of these 28% listed an area related to teaching, 22% to service, 17% to research/scholarship, and 33% to other areas. Over half (55%) indicated they had developed a niche beyond the institution; of these 7% related to teaching, 17% to service, 17% to research/scholarship; and 60% related to other areas. Only a small percentage of the respondents (15%) indicated they had already done their best work; the others indicated either that they were currently doing their best work (43%), or that their best work was still ahead of them (42%). A significantly greater percentage of those in the social sciences (51%) and the humanities (48%) than in the other disciplines believed their best work is yet to be done ($X^2 = 18.73$; $p < .01$).

Career/Life Issues. These faculty, with a mean age of 50, are experiencing traditional mid-life issues. A majority agree that they are examining their life more now (65%), that they are more committed to their work (70%), that they are thinking about their legacy (66%), that they feel more vital (59%), that they are concerned about the amount of time they have left in life (56%), and that their work load is heavier (63%), with the health professions expressing the strongest agreement (72%). A majority

disagree that "this is all there is in life" (65%), that they are becoming bored (72%), and that they feel very restless in their careers (69%). They are split evenly on whether they have more opportunities for continued growth and development than they have had previously. On issues concerning the relationship between their professional and personal lives, they are split evenly on whether the most important things in their lives involve work, and a slender majority (53%), except for the humanities faculty (63%), agreed that it is difficult to draw the line between work and leisure. The respondents tend to agree that their mood depends on how their work is going (67%), and that other things (e.g., personal/family life) in life are more important than work (73%), even though 60% also agree that they tend to subordinate other aspects of their lives to their work.

When asked to describe their lives right now, most tended toward the adjectives "interesting," "enjoyable," "worthwhile," "full," "hopeful," "free," and "rewarding." They also described themselves as "overworked" and "pressured." None of these descriptions varied significantly by discipline. Half of the respondents currently have children living at home, and about one in four has major responsibility for a dependent adult. Ninety-three percent rate their overall health as "excellent" or "good."

In reference to life changes of the past three years, 1% had lost a spouse, 20% had lost a parent, less than 1% had lost a child, 27% had lost another close relative or friend, 30% suffered illness/injury in their families, 6% had married, 7% had divorced or separated, 10% had had a child, 3% had adopted a

child, 26% had a child leave home, 6% added another adult to the family, 5% had an adult move out, and 12% had a family member face unemployment.

Future plans. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents do not want to move to another institution, with no significant differences by discipline. Overall 65% are not likely to move, with significant differences by discipline. The health professionals are the most likely to move (13% "almost certain," 30% "possible"), the humanities professors the least likely (2% "almost certain", 25% "possible"; $X^2 = 36.27$; $p < .001$). Almost 90% are not making plans to leave the institution. Eighty-five percent do not want to leave academe; 79% see little likelihood of leaving; and 93% are making no plans to leave, with no differences by discipline. Seventy-five percent of all respondents want to do something professionally that they have not yet done. Although close to a majority of faculty in each discipline want to do further research, the actual percentages range from 62% of the social scientists to 40% of the other professionals ($X^2 = 41.85$; $p < .001$).

When asked where they would spend an additional five hours per week, 51% of the respondents indicated personal rather than professional pursuits. The humanities professors, natural scientists and social scientists (39%; 28%, and 31% respectively) were most likely to want to spend their time in research; the health professionals and other professionals were most likely to want to spend their time in personal leisure (34% and 26% respectively) and family activities (24% and 21%) ($X^2 = 95.38$;

$p < .001$).

Of the entire sample, 27% anticipate retiring early, 36% at age 65, and 37% after age 65, with no significant differences by discipline.

DISCUSSION

This research study has taken a broad look at faculty careers, as reported by faculty members themselves. While the survey generated a wealth of data relevant for both research and policy studies, two general themes deserve special comment: findings related to faculty satisfaction and morale are significant as they relate to the burgeoning literature on this topic; and findings related to career differences by discipline are significant to the extent that they have not yet been reported by other investigators.

Satisfaction. Bowen and Schuster warn of a faculty "at risk" of becoming "dispirited," "devalued," "fragmented," and in general "imperiled" (1985, 1986). Other scholars report a generally high level of satisfaction uncovered in their research (Eble and McKeachie, 1985, and Sorcinelli, 1985). These contrary views of faculty satisfaction have competent researchers on both sides, with some researchers (e.g., Altbach, 1980; Apps, 1988; Boice, 1986) finding that as faculty age their productivity and vitality diminish, while others (e.g., Blackburn and Lawrence, 1986; Claxton and Murrell, 1984; Mangan, 1987; Austin and Rice, 1987) find continued enthusiasm and productivity among faculty.

Our evidence supports the view that aging faculty remain internally controlled, vital, and productive. Ninety percent

express overall satisfaction with their careers, and nearly as many would choose an academic career if they could make the decision again. Level of satisfaction does not vary significantly by race, gender, or academic discipline.

The vast majority of faculty have remained active in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty see the various components of their job as important to themselves and to their institutions. They rate their abilities high in all three areas. More than two-thirds express strong feelings of control over their careers, meaning that they can decide how much time to devote to an activity, where to put their major emphasis, and when to shift from one interest to another. Adult development theory supports the idea that to be content adults must view what they are doing as important to them and to their employers and they must have some measure of control over the important decisions in their lives (e.g., Erikson, 1982; Levinson, 1978, 1986). The high level of satisfaction among faculty is in part owing to their sense of efficacy and control.

Levinson (1978) discussed the importance of adults finding a niche, and we have seen that most faculty believe that they have found a special place for themselves, either in their institution or in their discipline. Most also feel more vital and committed to their work than ever before. Most by far report that they are presently doing their best work, or have yet to do it.

These senior faculty do not want to give up their jobs and leave academe, and most do not even want to leave their present institutions. Our findings reinforce the Carnegie evidence that

78% of faculty report that they would become a college teacher again, given the choice (Boyer, 1987).

In this survey we see evidence of the importance of administrative support to faculty satisfaction. In particular we have seen that recognition for faculty from administrators is one of the best predictors of faculty satisfaction. Lawrence and Blackburn (1988) found the congruence of faculty and administrative views on the importance of teaching a major factor in satisfaction. Although they and we have studied different aspects of faculty careers, we have all come to realize the important role administrators play in the level of faculty satisfaction.

All in all, our survey has revealed generally good faculty morale, a high level of satisfaction, and continued faculty vitality. These findings correspond to those of several other research projects (e.g., Lawrence and Blackburn, 1988; Eble and Mckeachie, 1987; Sorcinelli, 1985; Austin and Rice, 1987; and others). Compilation of evidence from a variety of studies has begun to present an overwhelming picture of a vital and productive faculty. These studies have covered a range of institutions, as well as different types, ages, genders, and races of faculty. While there are problems with faculty morale which deserve recognition, overall this picture refutes the image of a depressed and effete faculty.

Studies which revealed a negative view of faculty morale were made in a different time period than ours. Some (Bowen and Schuster, 1986; Clark, 1987) were conducted in the early 1980s

when the American economic and political climate was not as robust as during 1988 when we conducted our survey. In addition our survey was conducted in a region of the country which has not suffered greatly during the vagaries of the national economy. Virginia has enjoyed relative prosperity; it ranks about the middle of the United States in state support for higher education (half our institutions are state supported), and the cost of living has remained moderate. All of these factors possibly contributed to the rosier picture of faculty we revealed.

Disciplinary Differences

We have learned a great deal about how faculty live their lives differently depending on their disciplines. Very few of the other studies of faculty have taken disciplinary differences into account, yet these differences may help to explain many of the tensions in campus climate. Put simply, members of different disciplines lead different professional lives. They place their emphasis differently, they are motivated differently, and they find different avenues to satisfaction. Nevertheless, most studies of faculty have presented the professoriate as if it were a single homogeneous group.

Some studies have recognized in a limited manner the fact that different disciplines work differently. Lawrence and Blackburn (1987) studied faculty from eight disciplines, but they are all from the liberal arts: humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. Austin and Rice (1987) also observed disciplinary differences, but they only surveyed faculty in liberal arts colleges. None of the studies of faculty has

concentrated on the major differences between faculty in the liberal arts and sciences and those in the professions. Our study broke the distinction down into broad disciplines: humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, health professions, and other professions.

Areas of commonality do exist among the disciplines. There are no differences by discipline in overall satisfaction, and faculty from all disciplines see their lives as interesting and rewarding. There are no significant differences by discipline in interests in moving to another institution or in making plans to leave present institutions. And there are no differences in the expected retirement age.

On the other hand, there are areas of significance which help us identify a profile of faculty by discipline:

Humanities faculty. Of all the disciplines they are most likely to

*have been a faculty member at another institution (but they are least likely to have held a job outside the academy);

*spend the highest number of hours per week on the job;

*devote the highest percentage of this time to teaching;

*have been motivated to enter the profession by the desire to be a teacher;

*list teaching as their most accomplishment;

*find their institutional community in colleagues from departments other than their own;

*say that it is difficult to draw a line between work and leisure;

*perceive that they have the highest level of influence of all disciplines within the institution;

*spend five additional hours a week in research;

*collaborate least with colleagues;

*say they are stuck in their present job;

*claim that there is a gap between their expectations for the profession and the reality.

Social Scientists. Of all the disciplines they are most likely to

*have been motivated to enter the profession by the academic life style;

*list research as their most important accomplishment;

*want to do further research in the future;

*say their best work is ahead of them;

*have the lowest sharing of professional interests with colleagues;

*perceive they have the lowest influence within their discipline.

Natural Scientists. Of all the disciplines they are most likely to

*devote the highest percentage of their time to research;

*list research as their most important accomplishment (with social scientists);

*find their institutional community with colleagues from various departments other than their own (with the humanities and natural scientists);

*report working less hard than others in their discipline;

*maintain that they are least likely to hold a job outside the academy.

Health Professionals. Of all the disciplines they are most likely to

*spend the most hours working per week (with the humanities);

*devote the highest percentage of their job to service and the lowest percentage to teaching;

*move to another institution;

*spend an extra five hours a week in leisure or family activities;

*find their institutional community in people from various departments (with humanities and natural scientists);

*collaborate with colleagues on professional matters;

*perceive high influence within their discipline;

*discover high correspondence between expectations for the profession and the reality.

Other Professionals. Of all the disciplines they are most likely to

*work the least number of hours per week (still far

above the national work week of forty hours);

*devote the highest percentage of their hours to creative/other scholarly activities and the least amount to research;

*work in the same area of expertise as when first hired and first awarded tenure;

*have held a job outside the academy and be presently pursuing a job in consort with current academic job;

*report working harder than others in their department or school and in their discipline;

*spend five extra hours a week in leisure and family activities (with health professionals);

*claim the lowest influence within their institution;

*find their institutional community within the institution as a whole and their social community outside the institution altogether.

These findings help us understand the different attitudes faculty from various disciplines have toward their profession and their institutions. Since satisfaction does not vary significantly by discipline, the differences identified here do not directly affect morale. They do, however, help to explain different attitudes across campuses toward the role of teaching, research, and service in promotion and tenure decisions, toward the institutional mission, and toward the allocation of resources.

These are findings of initial investigation into an

area neglected by other researchers. Further research needs to be conducted with other faculty samples to confirm or disconfirm these early findings concerning disciplinary influence on faculty attitudes toward their careers.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has provided a comprehensive view of faculty careers, with an emphasis on the ways personal growth has interacted with professional development as influenced by discipline. Our detailed instrument, large sample, high response rate, full range of types of institutions, and diverse group of researchers have provided a complex view of the interaction of faculty careers, personal growth, and discipline not seen in other studies. The study has implications for faculty development, institutional personnel policy, and recruitment and use of faculty. Once institutions better understand faculty careers, better decisions can be made, for examples, about faculty work loads, institutional communities, and retirement plans.

References

Altbach, P.G. The crisis of the professoriate. Annals, AAPSS, 448 (March): 1-14, 1980.

Apps, J.W. Higher education in a learning society. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1988.

Armour, R.A., Caffarella, R.S., Fuhrmann, B.S., and Wergin, J.F. Senior faculty careers: Finding one's own niche. Paper presented at Virginia State Council of Higher Education Conference on Faculty Development, Norfolk, Virginia, 1987.

Austin, A.E., and Rice, R.E. Community, commitment and congruence: A different kind of excellence. Washington, D.C.: Council of Independent Colleges, 1987.

Blackburn, R.T., and Lawrence, J.H. Aging and quality of faculty performance. Review of Educational Research, 23 (Fall): 265-290, 1986.

Boice, R. Faculty development via field programs for middle-aged, disillusioned faculty. Research in Higher Education, 25: 115-135, 1986.

Bowen, H.R., and Schuster, J.H. American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Boyer, E.L. College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The faculty deeply troubled. Change, 17 (September/October): 31-34, 1985.

Clark, B.R. The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.

Claxton, C.S. and Murrell, P.H. Developmental theory as a guide for maintaining the vitality of college faculty. In C. M. N. Mehrota (Ed.), Teaching and aging. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 19. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1984.

Eble, K.E. and McKeachie, W.J. Improving undergraduate education through faculty development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Erikson, E.H. The life cycle completed. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1982.

Fuhrmann, B.S., Armour, R.A., Wergin, J.F., and Janha, D. S. To be or not to be: When and why faculty decide to be faculty. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April, 1988.

Lawrence, J., Blackburn, R., Pitney, J., and Trautvetter, L. Faculty and administrator views: The organizational climate for teaching. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, MO, October, 1988.

Levinson, D.J. A conception of adult development. American Psychologist, 40: 3-13, 1986.

Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H., and McKee, B. Seasons of a man's life. New York: Ballantine Books, 1978.

Mangan, K.S. Morale of professors found to be high at small colleges. The Chronicle of Higher Education, XXXIV: 1+A19, November 11, 1987.

Schuster, J.H. and Bowen, H.R. The faculty at risk. Change, 17 (September/October): 13-21, 1985.

Sorcinelli, M.D. Faculty careers: Personal, institutional and societal dimensions. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, 1985.

*This research was funded by a grant-in-aid from Virginia Commonwealth University